I affirm.

The traditional Copenhagen Interpretation of quantum mechanics holds that light waves instantaneously collapse into particles, which is a finite length over zero time, which is impossible. Only the Many-Worlds Interpretation escapes this dilemma and is thus more consistent with the rest of physics. **Vaidman 2**[[1]](#footnote-1)

**The reason for adopting the MWI is that it avoids the collapse of the quantum wave.** (Other non-collapse theories are not better than MWI for various reasons, e.g., nonlocality of Bohmian mechanics; and the disadvantage of all of them is that they have some additional structure.) **The collapse postulate** is a physical law that **differs from all known physics in two aspects: it is genuinely random and it involves** some kind of **action at a distance.** According to the collapse postulate the outcome of a quantum experiment is not determined by the initial conditions of the Universe prior to the experiment: only the probabilities are governed by the initial state. Moreover, Bell 1964 has shown that there cannot be a compatible local-variables theory that will make deterministic predictions. **There is no experimental evidence in favor of collapse and against the MWI. We need not assume that Nature plays dice. The MWI is a deterministic theory** for a physical Universe **and it explains why a world appears** to be **indeterministic for** human **observers.**

MWI undermines the notion of personal identity. **Vaidman 2**[[2]](#footnote-2)

"I" am an object, such as Earth, cat, etc. **"I" is defined at a particular time by a complete (classical) description of the state of my body** and of my brain. "I" and "Lev" do not name the same things (even though my name is Lev). **At the present moment there are many different [me's]** "Lev"s **in different worlds** (not more than one in each world), but it is meaningless to say that now there is another "I". I have a particular, well defined past: I correspond to a particular "Lev" in 2002, but **I do not have a well defined future: I correspond to a multitude of [me's]** "Lev"s in 2010. In the framework of the MWI it is meaningless to ask: Which Lev in 2010 will I be? I will correspond to them all. Every time I perform a quantum experiment (with several possible results) it only seems to me that I obtain a single definite result. Indeed, Lev who obtains this particular result thinks this way. However, this Lev cannot be identified as the only Lev after the experiment. Lev before the experiment corresponds to all "Lev"s obtaining all possible results. Although this approach to the concept of personal identity seems somewhat unusual, it is plausible in the light of the critique of personal identity by Parfit 1986. Parfit considers some artificial situations in which a person splits into several copies, and argues that there is no good answer to the question: Which copy is me? He concludes that **personal identity is not what matters when I divide.**

In the absence of personal identity, only end states can matter. **Shoemaker 99**[[3]](#footnote-3)

Extreme reductionism might lend support to utilitarianism in the following way. Many people claim that we are justified in maximizing the good in our own lives, but not justified in maximizing the good across sets of lives, simply because each of us is a single, deeply unified person, unified by the further fact of identity, whereas there is no such corresponding unity across sets of lives. But if the only justification for the different treatment of individual lives and sets of lives is the further fact, and this fact is undermined by the truth of reductionism, then nothing justifies this different treatment. **There are no deeply unified subjects of experience. What remains are merely the experiences themselves, and so any ethical theory distinguishing between individual lives** and sets of lives **is mistaken.** If the deep, further fact is missing, then there are no unities. **The morally significant units should then be the states people are in at particular times, and an ethical theory that focused on them** and attempted to improve their quality, whatever their location, **would be the most plausible. Util**itarianism **is just such a theory.**

Thus the standard is **Minimizing Suffering**. There are three additional warrants.

**First,** happiness is objectively good. Consistency requires we extend our own desire for happiness to others. **Sayre McCord** writes[[4]](#footnote-4)

According to the second argument, the evaluative starting point is again each person thinking "my own happiness is valuable," but this fact about each person is taken as evidence, with respect to each bit of happiness that is valued, that that bit is valuable. **Each person** is seen as **ha[s]**ving **reason to think that the happiness she enjoys is valuable, and** reason to think of others -- given that they are in a parallel situation with respect to the happiness they enjoy -- that each person's happiness is such **that there is the same evidence** available to each **for the value of the happiness that another person enjoys** as there is for the value of one's own happiness. **If** happiness is such that **every piece of it is desired by someone, then** it seems as if, **in** taking ourselves to have reason to **see[ing] the bit we value as valuable, we are committed to acknowledging the value of all the rest.**

**Second,** human equality is a basic assumption of any moral system. **Gosepath**[[5]](#footnote-5)

This fundamental idea of **equal respect for all persons** and of the equal worth or equal dignity of all human beings (Vlastos 1962) **is accepted as a minimal standard by all** leading **schools of** modern Western political and **moral culture. Any** political **theory abandoning this notion of equality will not be found plausible today. In a period in which metaphysical**, religious **and traditional views have lost their** general **plausibility** (Habermas 1983, p. 53, 1992, pp. 39-44), **it appears impossible to** peacefully **reach** a general **agreement** on common political aims **without accepting that persons must be treated as equals**. As a result, moral equality constitutes the ‘egalitarian plateau’ for all contemporary political theories (Kymlicka 1990, p.5).

Only util gives all people equal respect. **Rakowski**[[6]](#footnote-6)

On one side, it presses toward the consequentialist view that individuals' status as moral equals requires that the number of people kept alive [life] be maximized. Only in this way, the thought runs, can we give due weight to the fundamental equality of persons; **to allow more deaths when we can ensure fewer is to treat some** people **as less valuable than others.** Further, **killing some to save others**, or letting some die for that purpose, **does not entail that those who are killed** or left to their fate **are** being **used merely as means** to the well-being of others, as would be true if they were slain or left to drown merely to please people who would live anyway. They do, of course, in some cases serve as means. But they do not act merely as means. Those who die are no less ends than those who live. **It is because they are** also **no more ends than others** whose lives are in the balance **that an impartial decision-maker must** choose to **save the more numerous group, even if she must kill to do so.**

**And third,** util is the only moral system available to policy-makers. **Goodin 90** writes[[7]](#footnote-7)

My larger argument turns on the proposition that there is something special about the situation of public officials that makes utilitarianism more probable for them than private individuals. Before proceeding with the large argument, I must therefore say what it is that makes it so special about public officials and their situations that make it both more necessary and more desirable for them to adopt a more credible form of utilitarianism. Consider, first, the argument from necessity. **Public officials** are obliged to **make** their **choices under uncertainty**, and uncertainty **of a** very **special sort** at that. All choices – public and private alike – are made under some degree of uncertainty, of course. But in the nature of things, private individuals will usually have more complete information on the peculiarities of their own circumstances and on the ramifications that alternative possible choices might have for them. Public officials, in contrast, **[they] are** relatively **poorly informed as to the effects that their choices will have on individuals, one by one. What they** typically **do know are** generalities: **averages and aggregates. They know what will happen most often to most people** as a result of their various possible choices, **but that is all. That** is enough to **allow[s]** public **policy-makers to use** the **util**itarian **calculus** – assuming they want to use it at all – to chose general rules or conduct.

Ignore skepticism and presumption because moral uncertainty means we’ll always have a non-zero credence in the existence of morality, so there’s always a risk of offense in favor of one action.

**Plan**: The USFG ought to repeal section 20411 of the VCCLEA. I reserve the right to clarify, so no theory violations until he checks in CX. Current laws don’t matter because affirming means amending the laws to make the aff world consistent with them.

**Aff gets RVIs** on I meets and counter-interps because

(a) 1AR timeskew means I can’t cover theory and still have a fair shot on substance.

(b) no risk theory would give neg a free source of no risk offense which allows him to moot the AC.

**Contention 1** is **Competitiveness**

US economic competitiveness is declining now. The US needs more skilled workers to catch up to other countries. **Cooper et al. 12**[[8]](#footnote-8)

**The U.S. economy is weakening relative to our global competitors. Recent economic growth is 40 percent below any** other **growth period since World War II** as other economies around the globe draw in more investment, both foreign and domestic. In contrast, despite still being the world’s leading recipient of direct foreign investment, business investment overall in the United States between 2001 and 2007 was the slowest in U.S. history.

Meanwhile, **competition is on the rise.** From 1980 to 2011 **China increased its share of world economic output** from 2 percent to 14 percent. And **India more than doubled its output** during that period, from 2.5 percent of global production to 5.7 percent. **The U.S. share of the world economy fell to 19 percent from 25 percent.**

While increasing global competition is inevitable, lackluster U.S. performance need not be. Indeed, rising growth and incomes in other countries present potential new opportunities and markets for American workers and companies. But **if the U**nited **S**tates **means to continue to lead the world** and to share our prosperity with it**,** U.S. **policymakers must** deploy an American strategy that is responsive to modern economic challenges—a strategy that makes it possible for every American family to **ensure** that children entering adulthood are prepared to find a successful place in the global economy.

What should the strategy be? Economists of all stripes point to **a robust pipeline of skilled workers** as the essential ingredient of a strong and growing economy. Indeed, the two countries most rapidly gaining on the United States in terms of economic competitiveness—China and India—have ambitious national strategies of investing and promoting improved educational outcomes for children to strengthen their positions as contenders in the global economy.

Pell Grants for prisoners are key to improving the pool of skilled workers in America. **Buzzini 9** writes[[9]](#footnote-9)

[Brackets in original] **When an inmate is first released** from prison**,** it is not as if his (or her – women’s prisons are growing just as fast, perhaps even more rapidly than men’s) can simply go on as before. For example, if the inmate was making an honest income, **he may no longer be welcome at his previous work due to his ex-con**, or felon, **status. The job market might restrict him to jobs that keep him below the poverty line,** unable to take proper care of himself and his family. On the other hand, many offenders serving time today are in for mandatory drug sentencing. These offenders may be tempted to return to their drug-slinging ways, but now fear repercussions doubly, especially if they are closing in on a three-strike scenario (after which some states require a life sentence). But **how should a youth** fresh **from the inside be expected to get a job with an eighth-grade reading level and no skills in math, history, science, [or] the arts**, or even communication or basic socialization**?** “Ex-cons are often woefully unequipped to make it in the legit world. Prison education dramatically improves the odds. Studies have shown a 30 to 70 percent reduction in recidivism rates for those who get some higher education” (Leder 1). A study from the 1980s shows that **60 to 75 percent of inmates who** pursued (and **graduated**) **from higher education during their sentence were able to find the job**, compared to only 40 percent of inmates without a degree (Taylor “Pell Grants”). Jon Marc Taylor, who writes prolifically on the topic of prison education, has been featured in a number of journals, including the Correctional Education Association’s own publication, the *Journal of Correctional Education*. Taylor himself is three-time prison grad, earning his A.A., B.A., and M.A. from a PSCE program at his own prison. He has also received two journalism awards for his efforts (“Jon Marc Taylor”). Taylor knows the process in and out from his own struggles to find alternative sources for funding. He explains that college programs for inmates “offset the social stigma attached to ex-con status” (Taylor “Pell Grants”). This stigma is offset due to the fact that education acts as an actual rehabilitator. “There have been enough studies now that show high school graduation and [post-secondary] job preparation is a magical number. When people achieve those levels while incarcerated, there’s a much different rate of recidivism, employability, and success than those people who don’t,” says the executive director of the CEA, Stephen Steurer (Leder 2). Even former President Bill Clinton believed that these programs offer a good service at a reasonable price. He “opposed both the Wynn and Gordon amendments, backing Pell Grants to prisoners as rehabilitation” (“House Kills…”).

Education is key to competitiveness. **Cooper et al. 12**[[10]](#footnote-10)

**Competition from rapidly growing countries such as China and India are changing** business norms and the links between **national economies.** We are quite familiar with what economists call “global labor arbitrage,” the substitution of high-wage workers in advanced economy countries with low-wage workers in developing economies. That’s led to a global re-ordering of production, jobs, and growth.

More recently, **technological advances** in telecommunications and transportation, **as well as skills development** in the developing world, **are dragging** more **U.S. industries**—including computer programming, high-tech manufacturing, and service sectors—**into international competition.** This development is feeding a mounting demand for high-skilled labor around the world.

**To position the U**nited **S**tates **for the future,** substantial **investments are needed in** research, infrastructure, and **education.** The most important of these areas to address is education. Why? Because as this report shows, the **overwhelming economic evidence points to education**—and human capital investments, generally—**as the key drivers of economic competitiveness in the long term.**

Harvard University economist Gregory Mankiw, for example, has shown that **in** advanced countries such as **the U**nited **S**tates**, human capital investment had three times the positive effect on economic growth as did physical investment.** And educational investment is particularly important in early childhood development and learning, according to growth economists. The return on investment from interventions such as prenatal care and early childhood programs is higher than for virtually any class of financial assets over time, according to Nobel Prize winning economist James Heckman. The academic literature also shows that **failing to provide** broad **opportunities for** nurturing, **learning, and productive development harms economic** growth and national **competitiveness.**

Competitiveness decline tanks US military strength. **Baru 09**[[11]](#footnote-11)

Hence, economic policies and performance do have strategic consequences.2 In the modern era, the idea that **strong economic performance is the foundation of power** was argued most persuasively by historian Paul Kennedy. 'Victory (in war)', Kennedy claimed, 'has repeatedly gone to the side with more flourishing productive base'.3 **Drawing attention to** the **interrelationships between** economic **wealth, tech**nological **innovation, and the ability of states to** efficiently **mobilize economic and tech**nological **resources for power projection** and national defence, Kennedy argued that nations that were able to better combine military and economic strength scored over others. 'The fact remains', Kennedy argued, 'that all of the **major shifts in** the world's **military-power balance** have **followed alterations in** the **productive balances;** and further, that the rising and falling of the various empires and states in the international system has been confirmed by the outcomes of the major Great Power wars, where victory has always gone to the side with the greatest material resources'.4 In Kennedy's view, the **geopolitical consequences of** an economic crisis, or even **decline, would be** transmitted through a nation's **inability to** find adequate financial resources to simultaneously **sustain** economic growth and **military power**, the classic 'guns versus butter' dilemma.

American military strength solves extinction. **Barnett 11**[[12]](#footnote-12)

Events in Libya are a further reminder for **Americans** that we **stand at a crossroads** in our continuing evolution **as the** world's sole full-service **superpower.** Unfortunately, we are increasingly seeking change without cost, and shirking from risk because we are tired of the responsibility. We don't know who we are anymore, and our president is a big part of that problem. Instead of leading us, he explains to us. Barack Obama would have us believe that he is practicing strategic patience. But many experts and ordinary citizens alike have concluded that he is actually beset by strategic incoherence -- in effect, a man overmatched by the job. It is worth first examining the larger picture: We live in a time of arguably **the greatest structural change** in the global order yet **endured,** with th**is** historical moment's most amazing feature being its relative and absolute **lack of mass violence**. That is something to consider when Americans contemplate military intervention in Libya, because if we do take the step to prevent larger-scale killing by engaging in some killing of our own, we will not be adding to some fantastically imagined global death count stemming from the ongoing "megalomania" and "evil" of American "empire." We'll be engaging in the same sort of system-administering activity that has marked our stunningly successful stewardship of global order since World War II. Let me be more blunt: **As the guardian of globalization, the U.S.** military **has been the greatest force for peace the world has ever known. Had America been removed from** the global **dynamics** that governed the 20th century, the mass murder never would have ended. Indeed, it's entirely conceivable **there would now be no** identifiable **human civilization left, once nuclear weapons entered** the killing equation. But **the world did not keep sliding down** that path of **perpetual war.** Instead, **America** stepped up and **changed everything by ushering in** our now-perpetual **great-power peace. We introduced** the international liberal trade order known as **globalization** and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. **What resulted was** the collapse of empires, an explosion of **democracy**, the persistent spread of **human rights**, the liberation of women, the doubling of life expectancy, a roughly 10-fold **increase in** adjusted global **GDP and a profound** and persistent **reduction in** battle deaths from state-based **conflicts**. That is what American "hubris" actually delivered. Please remember that the next time some TV pundit sells you the image of "unbridled" American military power as the cause of global disorder instead of its cure. With self-deprecation bordering on self-loathing, we now imagine a post-American world that is anything but. Just watch who scatters and who steps up as the Facebook revolutions erupt across the Arab world. While we might imagine ourselves the status quo power, we remain the world's most vigorously revisionist force. As for the sheer "evil" that is our military-industrial complex, again, let's examine what the world looked like before that establishment reared its ugly head. The last great period of global structural change was the first half of the 20th century, a period that saw a death toll of about 100 million across two world wars. That comes to an average of 2 million deaths a year in a world of approximately 2 billion souls. Today, with far more comprehensive worldwide reporting, researchers report an average of less than 100,000 battle deaths annually in a world fast approaching 7 billion people. Though admittedly crude, these **calculations suggest a** 90 percent absolute drop and a **99 percent** relative **drop in death**s **due to war. We are** clearly **headed for a world** order **characterized by multipolarity**, something the American-birthed system was designed to both encourage and accommodate. **But** given how things turned out the last time we collectively faced such a fluid structure, **we would do well to keep** U.S. **power**, in all of its forms, deeply embedded in the geometry to come. To continue the historical survey, after salvaging Western Europe from its half-century of civil war, the U.S. emerged as the progenitor of a new, far more just form of globalization -- one based on actual free trade rather than colonialism. America then successfully replicated globalization further in East Asia over the second half of the 20th century, setting the stage for the Pacific Century now unfolding.

**Contention 2** is **Crime**

Providing Pell Grants to prisoners solves crime. **Buzzini 9** writes[[13]](#footnote-13)

It’s no secret that the education system in the United States is in shambles – and not just for inmates. **Students aren’t receiving a proper education, which encourages** the nation’s **youth to get involved in gangs, drugs, and violence. Many inmates can’t even read well, ranking in** at “maybe a **seventh-grade level**” (Leder 1). Were it possible for inmates to receive an education while serving time (a GED if an equivalent had not been attained, followed by a post-secondary degree) they would have a much greater chance of escaping the clutches of poverty and their ties to illegal activity when they are released back into society. This must have been the line of thinking that inspired the inception of the first post-secondary correctional education program, which began in 1953 at the University of Southern Illinois in Menard. Such a program must have been a bit ahead of its time, because by 1965 only 11 more post-secondary correctional education (PCSE) programs appeared. 1965 was a landmark year for PCSE it marked the first time that inmates were eligible to receive Pell Grants to fund their college aspirations. Thanks to the availability of federal funding, programs began popping up nationwide. In 1973 there were 182 programs; by 1982 there were 350. Programs reached their peak when, in the early 1990s, there were a total of 772 on-site college programs in 1,287 prisons (Taylor “Pell Grants” 2). The majority of inmates covered their costs with the aid of the Pell Grant. However, in 1994, thanks to the prevailing “tough on crime” attitude of the time, inmates were no longer able to receive federal aid in the form of Pell Grants. While peak enrollment in PCSE programs totaled at 12 percent of inmate populations, the s0-called “deteriorated state” counted less than 4 percent (Taylor “Pell Grants” 3). There is myriad statistical data to show that **education programs in**side **prisons aid in** actual **rehabilitation and** do **reduce recidivism** rates. But these facts were glossed over as politicians wowed their constituents with their tough policies regarding crime. However, they didn’t bother to mention to their constituents that “**Massachusetts, Maryland, and New York are among** the **states [that reported] reductions in recidivism of** as high as **15.5 percent for inmates who participated in education programs** (Freedman 6).” That 15.5 percent reduction means 15.5 percent of inmates were *actually* rehabilitated, as opposed to merely punished, during their time on the inside. The numbers are even more impressive on a national scale, as “**inmates with at least two years of college had a 10 percent re-arrest rate; the national average is 60 percent**” (“Statehouses Debate…”). That means 50 percent less people went back to prison, simply because they completed some form of higher education. It is for reasons such as this that “critics lament the loss of Pell Grants as short-sighted in light of studies documenting lower recidivism and misconduct rates among inmates who pursue post-secondary education” (Freedman 8). It truly is a serious loss, for the depletion of funding via Pell Grants for PSCE has resulted in a devastating loss of programs nationwide, despite such programs’ ability to reduce recidivism and markedly rehabilitate many inmates who participate. Should the Pell Grant be re-instated, corrections in America would see a much-needed turn for the better.

Crime kills international credibility. This evidence is amazing. The author works for the United Nations, so he’s most qualified on how the United States’ international reputation is declining. **Falk 12**[[14]](#footnote-14)

This unabashed avowal of imperial goals is the main thesis of the article, perhaps most graphically expressed in the following words: "The United States can increase the effectiveness of its military forces and make the world safe for soft power, America's inherent comparative advantage." As the glove fits the hand, **soft power** complements hard power within the wider enterprise of transforming the world in the United States' image, or at least in the ideal version of the United States' sense of self.

The authors acknowledge (rather parenthetically) that their strategy **may not work if the US continues** much longer **to be seen unfavourably abroad as a national abode of** drugs, **crime, [and] violence**, fiscal irresponsibility, family breakdown, and political gridlock. **They make a** rather meaningless **plea to restore "a** **healthy democracy" at home as a prelude to** the heavy lifting of **democratising the world, but they** do not pretend medical knowledge, and **offer no prescriptions for restoring the health of the American body politic.** And now, 16 years after their article appeared, it would appear that the adage, "disease unknown, cure unknown", applies.

International credibility solves multiple scenarios for extinction. **Nye and Armitage 07**[[15]](#footnote-15)

Soft power is the ability to attract people to our side without coercion. Legitimacy is central to soft power. **If a** people or **nation believes American objectives to be legitimate, we are more likely to persuade them to follow our lead** without using threats and bribes. **Legitimacy can also reduce opposition to**—and the costs of—**using hard power when the situation demands.** Appealing to others’ values, interests, and preferences can, in certain circumstances, replace the dependence on carrots and sticks. Cooperation is always a matter of degree, and it is profoundly influenced by attraction…The information age has heightened political consciousness, but also made political groupings less cohesive. Small, adaptable, transnational networks have access to tools of destruction that are increasingly cheap, easy to conceal, and more readily available. Although the integration of the global economy has brought tremendous benefits, **threats such as pandemic disease and the collapse of financial markets are more distributed and more likely to arise without warning. The threat of** widespread physical harm to the planet posed by **nuclear catastrophe** has existed for half a century, though the realization of the threat **will become more likely as the number of nuclear weapons states increases.** The potential security challenges posed by **climate change raise[s]** the possibility of an entirely **new** set of **threats** for the United States **to consider**… **States** and non-state actors who improve their ability to draw in allies will gain competitive advantages in today’s environment. Those **who alienate potential friends will stand at greater risk.** China has invested in its soft power to ensure access to resources and to ensure against efforts to undermine its military modernization. **Terrorists depend on** their ability to attract **support from the crowd** at least as much as their ability to destroy the enemy’s will to fight.

Existential risk outweighs every other impact by orders of magnitude because of the lost potential for future generations. **Bostrom 11**[[16]](#footnote-16)

Even if we use **the most conservative** of these **estimates,** which entirely ignores the possibility of space colonization and software minds, we **find that the expected loss of an existential catastrophe is greater than** the value of **1018 human lives.  This implies that** the expected value of **reducing existential risk by a mere one millionth of one percentage point is at least ten times the value of a billion human lives.**  The more technologically comprehensive estimate of 1054 human-brain-emulation subjective life-years (or 1052 lives of ordinary length) makes the same point even more starkly.  Even if we give this allegedly lower bound on the cumulative output potential of a technologically mature civilization a mere 1% chance of being correct, we find that the expected value of reducing existential risk by a mere one billionth of one billionth of one percentage point is worth a hundred billion times as much as a billion human lives.

Moral uncertainty means that extinction comes first under any moral system.

**Bostrom-2** writes[[17]](#footnote-17)

These reflections on **moral uncertainty suggest[s]** an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk. Let me elaborate. Our present understanding of axiology might well be confused. **[that] We may not** now **know**—at least not in concrete detail—**what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity;** we might not even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey. If we are indeed profoundly **uncertain about our ultimate aims,** then **we should recognize that there is** a **great option value in preserving**—and ideally improving—**our ability to recognize value and to steer the future accordingly. Ensuring that there will be a future version of humanity with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely is** plausibly **the best way** available to us **to increase the probability that the future will contain a lot of value.**

**Contention 3** is **Solvency**

Pell Grants are key. The vast majority of education programs for prisoners were cut when they couldn’t receive Pell Grants. **Jails to Jobs 13**[[18]](#footnote-18)

**Before 1995, prisoners had access to Pell Grants**, federal financial aid packages that are awarded to students from low-income families and don’t have to be repaid. The passage of **the 1994** Violent **Crime Control** and Law Enforcement **Act**, however, **changed all that** and prevented giving Pell Grants to prisoners.

According to a Quick & the Ed blog article of Nov. 5 by Education Sector Policy Analyst Sarah Rosenberg, **before 1995 there were about 350 college programs for prisoners in the U.S. In 2005 there were 12.**

Other grants fail. Pell Grants are key to stable funding. **Mentor 4**[[19]](#footnote-19)

Despite evidence supporting the connection between higher education and lowered recidivism, the U.S. Congress included a provision in the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 that eliminated Pell grants for prisoners. This law had a devastating effect on prison education programs. In 1990, there were 350 higher education programs for inmates. By 1997 only 8 programs remained. Ironically, at the same time as the federal government abolished Pell grants for prisoners, many states were undergoing a dollar-for-dollar tradeoff 1between corrections and education spending. New York State, for example, steadily increased its Department of Corrections budget by 76% to $761 million. During the same period, the state decreased funding to university systems by 28%, to $615 million. Much of the increase in corrections spending was the result of longer prison terms and the need for increased prison construction. In the 1993–1994 school year, more than 25,000 students in correctional facilities were recipients of Pell grants. **Although** these **[Pell] grants were not the only source of revenue** for these programs**, they provided a predictable flow of money that enabled** the **continued functioning of classes. Since there were no replacement funds, programs were forced to abandon efforts** to provide college courses in prison.

**Plans are good** for education because:

(a) Plans increase depth of education because we can focus on one specific issue each round instead of touching briefly on each aspect of the topic.

Depth is better than breadth. If we go in-depth on a *different* issue each round, then we’ll get a breadth of info any way, but if we spread ourselves thin discussing a breadth of issues each round, we’ll never have an in-depth discussion of the topic.

(b) Plans are key to incentivize continued research. If the same stock arguments are going to apply every round, there’s no incentive to do new work.

(c) Education for prisoners is uniquely key to topic education. It is the core of the topic. **Chlup 05**[[20]](#footnote-20)

The amount and type of education offered in corrections seem to change depending on the approach and philosophy to corrections that are dominant at the time. Historic links between prison reform and corrections education show that **when a punitive approach** (“lock them up and throw away the key”) **is ascendant, education**al programming **is de-emphasized. Instead inmates** may **spend** 17 **hours a day locked in their cells**, with one hour a day outside for exercise (Prison Activist Resource Center, retrieved May 16, 2004). At present, this approach is followed by several correctional institutions. **This** model **differs from a rehabilitative approach** in **which** sentencing is viewed as the punishment and time spent in correctional institutions **focuses on** rehabilitation, counseling, overcoming addictions, **acquiring vocational skills, and academic learning.** Earlier reformatory models sought to take a Progressive Era, rehabilitative approach (Gehring, 1995).

**Offense/defense** paradigm is good. Neg burden is to prove that a competitive post-fiat policy option is better than the aff. Two reasons:

**First**, this interp is most fair because it gives reciprocal burdens to both sides instead of allowing the neg to moot the AC by questioning one of its infinite assumptions, giving the neg a no-risk, insufficient burden which the aff can’t weigh against or win offense on.

**Second**, this interp is most educational because it deals with how philosophy is actually applied to the real world, i.e. as a guide for action instead of a pointless thought experiment.

Therefore, affirming the topic is equivalent to endorsing it as an advocacy.

Finally, the neg must defend one unconditional advocacy. Conditionality is bad because it makes the neg a moving target which kills 1AR strategy. He’ll kick it if I cover it and extend it if I undercover it, meaning I have no strategic options. Also, it’s unreciprocal because I can’t kick the AC.

## Democracy Advantage

American democracy is declining now. **Browder 1/5**[[21]](#footnote-21)

1. Election 2012 and the Future of American Democracy.

**America is changing in ways that are** important, exciting, and **unsettling for** the future of American **democracy.** Barack Obama swept into the White House in 2008, and he was reelected in 2012 with inspiring grandeur; but economic crisis and **divisive politics have raised questions** not only **about** his vision but **the functionality of our "Great Experiment."**

2. Is America Dying?

I propose that **the favorable systemic environment of American democracy has disappeared;** we have entrapped American democracy within a philosophical civil war; **American democracy no longer works the way it has in the past**; and Americans seem to be tiring of their historic Great Experiment. My theoretical supposition is that, if these four propositions are true, then, systemically, America is dying.

3. How Dare I Ask: "Is America Dying"?

The possible demise of America is an unpleasant thought; but that is my compelling "what if" question for America as Barack Obama enters the legacy stage of his two-term presidency. I believe that analyzing America's democratic destiny -- thoroughly, critically, and perhaps terminally -- is the central public debate of our time.

4. What Do I Mean by "America," "American Democracy," and "Dying"?

I define America as a national experiment in democratic ideals. I use the term "American democracy" to refer to the practical mix of people, politics, and government whereby we have pursued democratic ideals, fairly effectively, for the past two centuries. And "dying" can be viewed as the increasing inability of the American system to perform normal, sustaining, necessary functions of life.

5. Could 932,367 Secessionists Be Right about the United States?

Secession is not the answer to our distemper. However, the ease and quickness and fervor with which the White House petitions took hold is indicative of something awry. Considering the distempered condition of contemporary America, we have to keep wary watch on such movements. There is a disturbing confluence of negative developments at the national level that fuel these outbursts at a critical time for American democracy.

6. A Systems Analysis of American Democracy.

According to my systemic analysis, **our closing natural conditions and declining support for national authority have produced an unfavorable environment for American democracy;** furthermore, **a philosophical civil war has** entrapped, or **"boxed" American democracy in a destructive fight over** ideals, values, and **governance.**

7. The Systemic Environment of Dying America.

The original challenge of westward expansion and the subsequent challenge of political nationalization have contributed greatly and sequentially to the evolving success of American democracy. However, in the latter half of the Twentieth Century, this historically-favorable environment turned sour.

8. A Philosophical Civil War in Dying America.

We have entrapped our national democratic experiment within a philosophical civil war about "what America means" and "how America ought to work." The struggle for control of the American experiment in terms of newly contentious ideals, substantive values, and procedural principles, present a national challenge that is qualitatively different from anything experienced within the past century.

Increased investment in education strengthens democracy. Multiple countries prove. **Glaeser 09**[[22]](#footnote-22)

One way to read the graph is that there are basically no countries with very low levels of education that have managed to be democratic over the long term, and almost every country with a high level of education has remained a stable democracy.

Thomas **Jefferson wrote that “if a nation expects to be ignorant and free,** in a state of civilization, **it expects what never was and never will be.”** In 1960, 36 nations had less than 1.74 years of schooling (which happens to be the level that Afghanistan has today). Of those 36 countries, only two — India and Botswana — managed to have average democracy scores above 4.2.

Out of the 19 countries in this sample with more than 5.3 years of schooling (the current level in Iran) in 1960, 17 have average democracy scores above 7.9. Fifteen of these have been perfectly democratic, at least by the standards of Polity IV. Only Poland and Hungary were dictatorships, and one can certainly argue that those places would have been democracies in 1960s if it were not for Soviet troops.

But in the middle ranges of education, between two and five years on average, almost anything goes.

Some places, like Costa Rica and Italy, have been extremely democratic, while others, like Kuwait and Paraguay, have not. Iraq falls into this category today, which suggests a fair amount of uncertainty about that country’s political future.

Why do I think that the chain of causality runs from education to democracy rather than the reverse? Democracy in 1960 is essentially uncorrelated with subsequent growth in the levels of education. **Education** in 1960, on the other hand, does an extremely good job of predicting **increases** in democracy.

The ability of education to predict **the durability of democracy** is well illustrated by the paths of former Communist bloc countries. **Initially well-educated places, like the Czech Republic and Poland, have** managed to **transition[ed] to**ward **being well-governed republics. Poorly educated places have not.**

Why is there a connection between human capital and freedom? Giacomo Ponzetto, Andrei Shleifer and I have argued that the connection reflects the ability of educated people to organize and fight collaboratively. Dictators provide strong incentives for the ruling clique; democracies provide more modest benefits for everyone else. **For democracy to beat dictatorship, the dispersed population needs to** have the skills and motivation to work **collaboratively** to **defeat** dictatorial coups and **executive aggrandizement.**

**Education teaches skills, like reading and writing, that enable people to work collaboratively.** At younger grades, teachers spend a lot of time teaching children how to get along. **In the U**nited **S**tates**, education is strongly linked to civic engagement and membership in social groups.** The ability to work together enables the defense of democracy.

One of the key moments in the recent history of democracy was the 1991 Soviet coup, in which the die-hard Soviets seemed poised to stop Russia’s rush to freedom.

The coup was thwarted by mass uprisings that were organized by well-educated Muscovites. They distributed fliers that brought out the crowds and used trolleys and street-cleaning machines to block the movements of tanks. One of my favorite episodes from this defense of democracy was the constant playing of music from Boris Godunov, a wordless reminder of the need to fight for freedom.

**Argentina’s** relatively **low level of education in 1930 left it ill equipped to defend its democratic institutions against would-be dictators**, who then adopted policies that impoverished the nation**.** **Today, Argentina is well enough educated that its political prognosis is** far more **positive.**

Instead, we must worry about the future of a democratic Afghanistan. The problematic recent elections in that country are unsurprising given its dearth of human capital. Given just the historical connection between education and democracy, the fight to foster freedom in that country is likely to be a long, uphill struggle.

US democracy gets modeled globally. **London 01** writes[[23]](#footnote-23)

Fourth, the United States possesses a sense of moral universalism that exists nowhere else. **When one talks about** some sort of example—**a model of** human rights, constitutionalism, subsidiarity, **rule of law**, and property rights—**the U**nited **S**tates **stands alone. It is the model.** Not long ago several **Hudson Institute scholars** had the opportunity to spend some time in Indonesia, and we **found that Indonesia does not turn** for its models **to China or Japan;** it looks to the United States. **The** new **Indonesian president** is very keen on establishing a form of federalism. What does he **look[s] to**? **The American Constitution.** Fifth and last, the rest of the world looks to the United States for answers. Very recently, an American deputy secretary of state said, “**Everyone’s crisis is America’s crisis**.” Why? **Because the world looks to the U**nited **S**tates **as its model.** As a consequence, there is no question that the United States will maintain its extraordinary leadership.

Democracy solves multiple scenarios for extinction. **Diamond 95** writes[[24]](#footnote-24)

**Nuclear, chemical and bio**logical **weapons continue to proliferate**. The very source of life on Earth, **the global ecosystem**, **appears increasingly endangered.** Most of **these new and unconventional threats** to security **are associated with** or aggravated by **the weakness** or absence **of democracy, with its provisions for legality, accountability, popular sovereignty and openness.** The experience of this century offers important lessons. Countries that govern themselves in a truly democratic fashion **[democracies] do not go to war with one another.** They do not aggress against their neighbors to aggrandize themselves or glorify their leaders. Democratic governments do not ethnically "cleanse" their own populations, and **they are much less likely to face ethnic insurgency. Democracies do not sponsor terrorism against one another.** They do not build weapons of mass destruction to use on **or** to **threaten one another. Democratic countries form more reliable, open, and enduring trading partnerships.** In the long run **they offer better and more stable climates for investment. They are more environmentally responsible because they must answer to their own citizens, who** organize to **protest** the destruction of their environments. They are better bets to honor international treaties since they value legal obligations and because their openness makes it much more difficult to breach agreements in secret. **Precisely because**, within their own borders, **they respect competition, civil liberties, property rights, and the rule of law, democracies are the only reliable foundation on which** a new world order of **international security** and prosperity **can be built.**

## ILaw Advantage

Prison education is key to ILaw. **Whitney 9**[[25]](#footnote-25)

International law considers the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as customary international law, which means that it has been recognized as “international custom, as evidence of a general practice accepted as law” under the Statute of the International Court of Justice (“ICJ”). So, with “state practice, and a sense of legal obligation, or opinio juris,” a customary norm is born.145 While not binding, customary norms are still highly influential. International legal scholar Richard Bilder has observed that: **[S]tandards set by the U**niversal **D**eclaration of **H**uman **R**ights, although initially only declaratory and non-binding, **have** by now, **through wide acceptance and recitation** by nations as having normative effect, **become binding** customary law**.** Whatever may be the weight of this argument, it is certainly true that the Declaration is in practice frequently invoked as if it were legally binding, both by nations and by private individuals and groups. While not binding, customary norms are still highly influential. International legal scholar Richard Bilder has observed that: **Article 26** of the Declaration speaks directly to the fundamental right to education. It succinctly **states that “[e]veryone has a right to education.”**147 The purpose of this general statement is to “[develop] . . . the human personality” and promote respect, tolerance, and appreciation among all groups of people.148 This purpose aligns with the conclusion in McGee v. Aaron stressing the importance of education in improving self-esteem and contributing to a person’s successful functioning in society.149 Richard Pierre Claude, author of The Right to Education and Human Rights Education, discusses Article 26 in detail Education takes on the status of a human right because it is integral to and enhances human dignity through its fruits of knowledge, wisdom, and understanding. . . . It is a social right because in the context of the community it promotes the full development of the human personality. It is an economic right because it facilitates economic self-sufficiency through employment or self-employment. It is a cultural right . . . . In short, education is a prerequisite for individuals to function as fully human being in modern society.151 **Because the Declaration** of Human Rights **is customary** international **law, it is** s **binding on** all nations, including **the U**nited **S**tates**.** **Prisoners**, though restricted in some of their rights, **are still citizens. The U**nited **S**tates **is obligated under** customary **i**nternational **law to ensure that all** of its citizens, and thus its **prisoners**, **have access to education.**

Every violation of I-Law matters. It sets a precedent for future decisions.

**Calabresi 5** writes[[26]](#footnote-26)

Six Justices on the Rehnquist Court signed on to the conclusion in Roper that the Court may, at least on some occasions, rely upon foreign sources of law. We submit, therefore, that such reliance is not likely to wane anytime soon, even with two new appointments, and that the real question for the future is not whether but when the Court will cite foreign sources of law. This is especially true since **reliance upon** such **[foreign] sources of law has a self-validating and snowballing aspect to it, wherein the more significant and widespread the Court's use of foreign sources now, the greater the body of precedent the Court will have to cite for using foreign sources of law in the future.**

I-Law solves multiple scenarios for extinction but US commitment is key.

**IEER 2**[[27]](#footnote-27)

The evolution of international law since World War II is largely a response to the demands of states and individuals living with**in a global society with a deeply integrated world economy.** In this global society, **the repercussions of** the **actions** of states, non-state actors, and individuals **are not confined within borders, whether we look to greenhouse gas** accumulations, **nuclear testing,** the danger of **accidental nuclear war, or the** vast **massacre**s **of civilians** that have taken place over the course of the last hundred years and still continue. **Multilateral agreements** increasingly have been a primary instrument employed by states to meet extremely serious challenges of this kind, for several reasons. They clearly and publicly embody a set of universally applicable expectations, including prohibited and required practices and policies. In other words, they **articulate global norms, such as** the protection of human rights and **the prohibitions of genocide and use of** **w**eapons of **m**ass **d**estruction. **They establish predictability and accountability** in addressing a given issue. States are able to accumulate expertise and confidence by participating in the structured system offered by a treaty. However, influential U.S. policymakers are resistant to the idea of a treaty-based international legal system because they fear infringement on U.S. sovereignty and they claim to lack confidence in compliance and enforcement mechanisms. This approach has dangerous practical27 implications for international cooperation and compliance with norms. U.S. treaty partners do not enter into treaties expecting that they are only political commitments by the United States that can be overridden based on U.S. interests. **When a powerful** and influential **state like the U**nited **S**tates is seen to **treat[s] its legal obligations as a matter of convenience** or of national interest alone, **other states will see this as** a **justification to** relax or **withdraw from their** own **commitments.** If the United States wants to require another state to live up to its treaty obligations, it may find that the state has followed the U.S. example and opted out of compliance.
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